

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 13-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-6, 13-15 and 18 have been amended herein to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to correct minor informalities.

Claims 7-12 and 19-24 are withdrawn from consideration as a result of the Restriction Requirement dated July 7, 2000 and have been cancelled herein.

I. FORMAL MATTERS

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-6 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

The Office Action does not indicate whether the formal drawings filed on November 10, 1999 are acceptable. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to do so.

The Office Action acknowledges the claim for priority, and indicates that the Priority Documents submitted in the parent application were received.

The Office Action includes a copy of the PTO Form 1449 that was submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on August 30, 1999. The reference listed therein is initialed by the Examiner, thereby indicating that this reference was considered.

Applicant has amended the specification herein to correct minor informalities.

II. REJECTIONS OF THE CLAIM UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 13-15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Regarding claims 1, 4, 14 and 15, the Examiner asserts that the use of the passive

voice renders the claim unclear. Applicant has amended these claims to eliminate some of the uses of the passive voice. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the use of the passive voice does not render the claims unclear. For example, Applicants submit that lines 1-3 of claim 4 are not indefinite and would be understood by one skilled in the art. In fact, due to the unique nature of claim drafting, claims often use the passive voice.

The Examiner further asserts that it is unclear how the paper rolls are loaded and how the spindle receptacles are inserted. Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would know how to load the paper rolls and this feature does not have to be recited in the claims.

II. ART-BASED REJECTIONS

Claim 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Nos. 5,690,774 (Greene), 5,072,306 (Matsumoto), 938,885 (McCulley) and 5,838,354 (Yamada). This rejection is traversed.

Applicant submits that none of the applied prior art references teaches or suggests a large printer having sheet feeding area positioned at a height where a user can easily set up a printing medium, as recited by claim 13, on which claims 14-18 depend. The Examiner does not specifically mention this claim feature in his rejection. Therefore, since none of the applied prior art references teaches each and every feature of claims 13-18, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/386,000

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


John J. Penny, Jr.
Registration No. 36,984

Date: December 19, 2000